

Attorney Docket: 24795
Serial No.: 09/937,848
Filed: January 18, 2002

necessarily make them independent or distinct inventions. The classification system at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is based in part upon administrative concerns and is not necessarily indicative of separate inventive subject matter in all cases.

Furthermore, applicants have paid a filing fee for an examination of all the claims in this application. If the Examiner refuses to examine the claims paid for when filing this application and persists in requiring applicants to file divisional applications for each of the groups of claims, the Examiner would essentially be forcing applicants to pay duplicative fees for the non-elected or withdrawn claims, inasmuch as the original filing fees for the claims (which would be later prosecuted in divisional applications) are not refundable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the restriction requirement, and to examine all of the claims pending in this application.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this matter, he is welcomed to contact the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number and address.

Attorney Docket: 24795
Serial No.: 09/937,848
Filed: January 18, 2002

Respectfully submitted,

NATH & ASSOCIATES

Date: _____

July 11, 2003

NATH & ASSOCIATES

1030 Fifteenth Street, N.W.
Sixth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 775-8383
Fax: (202) 775-8396
GMN:JLM:sv/rrr.wpd

[Signature]

Gary M. Nath
Reg. No. 26,965
Jerald L. Meyer
Reg. No. 41,194
Customer No. 20529